

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 173, 175-222, 224, 225 and 227-243, and 245 are pending in the above-captioned application. Claim 234 has been amended to include all the limitations of allowable claim 244, which has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the undersigned in conducting a teleconference interview on February 1, 2005 in which the claims were discussed in view of the Examiner's drawing objections noted below.

**I. Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in claims 173, 175-222, 224, 225 and 227-233 of the instant application. The Examiner suggested that Applicants submit a new drawing Figure 49 referenced above to further illustrate all features of the claims. In the interest of expediting prosecution of the instant application to allowance and issuance, Applicants have agreed to comply with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicants believe that there is more than adequate support throughout the specification and the originally filed drawings to provide support for Figure 49 and for the claimed features of the instant invention. As agreed to by the Examiner, no new matter has been entered. Thus, the instant objection should now be overcome.

**II. Claim Objections**

Claims 173, 175-222, 224, 225 and 227-233 were objected to because they allegedly claimed features which were not shown in the drawings as objected to above. These claims were indicated to be allowable with appropriate drawings corrections. In light of Applicants amendments entered herein, the instant claim objections should now be overcome. Claims 244 and 245 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. All the limitations of allowable claim 244 have been added to independent claim 234. Accordingly, independent claim

Appl. No. 10/674,060  
Amnd dated February 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

234, and dependent claims 235-243 and 245 which depend therefrom, should now be allowable and passed to issuance.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 234-236, 239 and 240 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Chau et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0036126) ("Chau"). Claims 234-240, 242 and 243 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Choi et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,566,704) ("Choi"). Claims 234, 235, 242 and 243 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Avouris et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0061422) ("Avouris"). Claim 241 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Choi in view of Giebelter et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0042562) ("Giebelter"). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejections of these claims, and in the interests of expediting prosecution of this application, the instant claim rejections have now been rendered moot by Applicants' amendments to independent claim 234 referenced above in which the limitations of allowable claim 244 have been incorporated therein. Accordingly, independent claim 234, and dependent claims 235-243 and 245 which depend therefrom, should now be allowable and passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew L. Filler  
Reg. No. 44,107

NANOSYS, INC.  
2625 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Tel. (650) 331-2176  
Fax (650) 331-2191

Appl. No. 10/674,060  
Amnd dated February 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Applicants submit herewith new drawing Figure 49. There is replete support throughout the specification and the originally filed drawing figures for the subject matter of new Figure 49 and thus no new matter is entered.